



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,545	01/23/2006	Sophie Marquis-Bienewald	HM1522927APCT	2393
324	7590	10/06/2009		
JoAnn Villamizar Ciba Corporation/Patent Department 540 White Plains Road P.O. Box 2005 Tarrytown, NY 10591			EXAMINER PAGONAKIS, ANNA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/06/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

andrea.dececchis@ciba.com
deborah.pinori@ciba.com
sonny.nkansa@basf.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/565,545

Applicant(s)

MARQUAIS-BIENEWALD ET AL.

Examiner

ANNA PAGONAKIS

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 24, 26, 29 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 24, 29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office Action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's payment and submission filed 7/13/2009, has been received and entered into the present application. Accordingly, prosecution has been reopened.

Claims 22, 24, 26, 29 and 31 are pending. Accordingly, claim 26 remains withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, filed 7/13/2009 have been fully considered. Rejections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22, 24 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, has possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

Present claims are directed to a method for the antimicrobial treatment of a surface of a plastic comprising contacting said surface of a plastic with a surface coating composition containing an antimicrobially effective amount of a 2,4-bis(alkylamino)pyrimidine of formula 1.

The specification and claims as originally filed fail to provide adequate written description for the newly amended limitation of "when R₂ is hydrogen, one of R₃ and R₄ is hydrogen; one of R₄ and R₆ is C₁-C₂₀alkyl and either R₃ or R₄ or R₅ and R₆ together form a pyrrolidone, piperidine or morpholine ring". Applicant has not provided Applicant any direction as to where the newly added claim limitations can be found in the instant disclosure, instead Applicant contends that support is inherent in the claims (page 1 of the response). Upon review of the disclosure, no such limitation, "when R₂ is hydrogen, one of R₃ and R₄ is hydrogen; one of R₄ and R₆ is C₁-C₂₀alkyl and either R₃ or R₄ or R₅ and R₆ together form a pyrrolidone, piperidine or morpholine ring" was found. While it is recognized that adequate written description of a limitation is not required to be stated in *haec verba* in the specification or claims as originally filed, adequate written support for all claim limitations must arise from either an explicit or implicit suggestion by the disclosure to show that such a concept as now claimed was actually in possession of the Applicant at the time of the invention. It cannot be said that a subgenus is necessarily

described by a genus encompassing it and a species upon which it reads. See In re Smith 173 USPQ 679, 683 (CCPA 1972) and MPEP 2163.05.

MPEP 2163 states, "The courts have described the essential question to be addressed in a description requirement issue in a variety of ways. An objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement, does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invention what is claimed." *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Under *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-1564, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991), to satisfy the written description requirement, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention, and that the invention, in that context, is whatever is now claimed. The test of sufficiency of support in a parent application is whether the disclosure of the application relied upon "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at the time of the later claimed subject matter," *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co., Inc.* 772 F.2d 1570, 1575, 227 USPQ 177, 179 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (quoting *In re Kaslow*, 707 F.2d 1366, 1375, 217 USPQ 1089, 1096 (Fed. Cir. 1983))... Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether the specification conveys with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc., v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991)."

Accordingly, the claims are considered to lack sufficient written description and are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22, 24, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of antimicrobial treatment of compounds PY 5, 8, 9, 44 and 55, does not reasonably provide enablement for the compounds of claims 22, 24, 26, 29 and 31. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In this regard, the application disclosure and claims have been compared per the factors indicated in the decision *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988) as to undue experimentation. The factors include:

- 1) the nature of the invention;
- 2) the breadth of the claims;
- 3) the predictability or unpredictability of the art;
- 4) the amount of direction or guidance presented;
- 5) the presence or absence of working examples;
- 6) the quantity of experimentation necessary;
- 7) the state of the prior art; and,
- 8) the relative skill of those skilled in the art.

The relevant factors are addressed below on the basis of comparison of the

disclosure, the claims and the state of the prior art in the assessment of undue experimentation.

The presently claimed invention is directed a method for the antimicrobial treatment of a surface of a plastic comprising administration of a 2,4-bis(alkylamino)pyrimidine of formula I. However, the instant specification as originally filed lacks adequate guidance, direction or discussion to apprise the skilled artisan how the claimed compound may be used to achieve the disclosed utilities for antimicrobial treatment of a surface of a plastic comprising administration of a 2,4-bis(alkylamino)pyrimidine of formula I, with at least a reasonable expectation of successfully achieving the treatment of the same. The instant specification fails to present any evidence, either in the form of data or scientifically sound reasoning, which would provide such a reasonable expectation that the claimed compounds would have been effective for the claimed mechanistic effects.

In the instant case, Applicant has provided several examples in the specification including the antimicrobial treatment of compounds PY 5, 8, 9, 44 and 55.

Notably, however, the purported effect of antimicrobial treatment of all compounds of formula 1 is never described within the four corners of the instant specification. Though Applicant's examples in this regard are duly noted, Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the instantly claimed compounds actually functions as an antimicrobial treatment. Further, it is noted that, while the lack of a working embodiment

cannot be the *sole* factor in determining enablement, the absence of substantial evidence commensurate in scope with the breadth of the presently claimed subject matter, in light of the unpredictable nature of the chemical and pharmaceutical arts and the limited direction that Applicant has presented, provides additional weight to the present conclusion of insufficient enablement in consideration of the *Wands* factors as a whole.

In the absence of such discussion or evidence, it is clear that the instant specification fails to support the enablement of antimicrobial treatment of the compounds of formula 1, such that the skilled artisan would have reasonably expected that the instantly claimed compound, effective in this manner, would have functioned to achieve the disclosed utility.

As stated in MPEP §2164.04[R-1], "Doubt may arise about enablement because information is missing about one or more essential parts or relationships between parts which one skilled in the art could not develop without undue experimentation." In the instant case, the information that is missing is a clear correlation between the claimed compound and its efficacy in treating the disclosed conditions, either through specific evidence in the form of data demonstrating such a fact or at least a sound mechanistic correlation between the claimed compound, *its ability to function in such a manner* and the amenability of the claimed effect state to treatment using an agent capable of functioning in this manner. It remains that the instant specification conspicuously fails to provide any guidance or direction in support of the *reasonable expectation of success* in actually

achieving antimicrobial treatment using the instantly claimed compounds of formula 1 in the absence of any evidence supporting the allegation that the claimed compound is, in fact, effective to achieve such an objective, either by reduction to practice or at least by elucidating the mechanism by which the claimed compound works. In the absence of this information, the specification fails to provide adequate guidance and/or direction to one of skill in the art at the time of the invention that would have enabled such a person to practice the instantly claimed invention without having to resort to undue experimentation to determine how, in fact, one would achieve the instantly disclosed objective(s).

The basis for the present rejection is not simply that experimentation would be required, since it is clear from the state of the prior art and Applicant's disclosure and remarks that experimentation in this particular art is not at all uncommon, but that the experimentation required in order to practice the full scope of the invention would be *undue*. Please reference *In re Angstadt*, 537 F.2d 498, 504, 190 USPQ 214, 219 (CCPA 1976), which states, "The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, *if experimentation is necessary, it is undue*." (emphasis added) Accordingly, in the absence of any adequate disclosure, direction or guidance as to how one would go about using the instantly claimed compound with a reasonable expectation of successful antimicrobial treatment of the compounds of formula 1, it remains that the pharmaceutical, chemical and medical arts are notoriously complex such that methods of use would have been sufficiently unpredictable to warrant the need for undue

experimentation to actually practice the full scope of the invention as instantly claimed.

In view of the discussion of each of the preceding seven factors, the level of skill in the art is high and is at least that a scientist with several years of experience in the art.

As the cited art and discussion of the above factors establish, practicing the claimed method in the manner disclosed by Applicant would not imbue the skilled artisan with a reasonable expectation or ability to make and use the full scope of the invention as instantly claimed, given the disclosure and supporting examples provided in the present specification and the state of the art at the time of the invention. In order to actually achieve the claimed invention, it is clear from the discussion above that the skilled artisan could not rely upon Applicant's disclosure as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and would have no alternative recourse but the impermissible burden of undue experimentation in order to practice the full scope of the embodiments presently claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22, 24, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Present claim 22 is directed to a method for the antimicrobial treatment of a surface of a plastic, which method comprises contacting the surface of a plastic with a surface coating composition containing an antimicrobially effective amount of formula 1.

MPEP §2163 recites, "The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus." Please reference *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

Regarding the limitation of "a method for the antimicrobial treatment of a surface of a plastic" (claim 22), Applicant states at page 1, first two lines, "The present invention relates to the use of substituted 2,4-bis(alkylamino)pyrimidines in the antimicrobial treatment of surfaces and to the preparation of such compounds."

The instant specification provides a non-limiting definition and description of a single species of agent that is a method of antimicrobial treatment that Applicant states is encompassed by, and useful for, the presently claimed invention. Disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, such as a structure or other physical or chemical properties, or functional characteristics beyond the generic disclosure of selectively behaving as an antimicrobial that would be sufficient to demonstrate that Applicant was in possession of the entire genus of compounds capable of having antimicrobial activity is absent from the specification. Please see *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406 and MPEP §2163.

While it is duly noted that the genus of the antimicrobial treatment of a surface of a plastic is limited to those compounds capable of this function, it remains that Applicant has not appropriately defined the metes and bounds of the genus, even when limited by function (step-plus-function form). MPEP §2163 teaches that step-plus-function claims are adequately described if "the written description adequately links or associates adequately described particular structure, material, or acts to the function recited in a step-plus-function claim limitation," or if "it is clear based on the facts of the application that one skilled in the art would have known what structure, material, or acts perform the function recited in a step-plus-function limitation." The instant application does not meet these criteria. The present specification provides no disclosure beyond the exemplary PY 5, 8, 9, 44 and 55 compounds, of which only a single species is disclosed, that would provide a means for identifying materials, other than those specifically disclosed by Applicant,

that would have been amenable for use in the present invention, nor does it teach the specific structure, physical properties or a method of identification of such compounds that perform the function recited in the claim. Furthermore, it has been held that a wish or plan for obtaining the chemical invention as claimed does not provide adequate written description of a chemical invention. Rather, a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name or physical properties, is required. Please reference, e.g., *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 927, 69 USPQ2d 1886, 1894-95 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

While it is recognized that adequate written description of a limitation is not required to be stated *in haec verba* in the specification or claims as originally filed, adequate written support for claim limitations must arise from either an explicit or implicit suggestion by the disclosure to show that such a concept as claimed was actually in possession of Applicant at the time of the invention. For the reasons provided *supra*, Applicant has failed to provide the necessary teachings, by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means that fully set forth the claimed invention, in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that Applicant had possession of the entire genus of agents that inhibit c-kit (claim 9).

Accordingly, claims 22, 24, 29 and 31 fail to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and are, thus, properly rejected.

Conclusion

No claim is found to be allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANNA PAGONAKIS whose telephone number is (571)270-3505. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday, 9am to 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AP

/Patricia A. Duffy/

Application/Control Number: 10/565,545

Page 14

Art Unit: 1614

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645